

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and the telephone interview conducted with the Examiner, Kevin P. Kerns, on December 21, 2007. The following remarks are presented for the Examiner's consideration.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over the applicants' admitted prior art (hereinafter "AAPA" – paragraphs [0004]-[0011] of specification; and "Prior Art" Figures 3 and 4) in view of JP 2003285167A (hereinafter "Nishimura"). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

During the interview, the Examiner observed and agreed with applicant that the Advisory Action did not address the gist of applicant's argument. Accordingly, applicant provides a summary and clarification of its argument in response to the Examiner's request.

As to claim 1, the aspect of the claimed subject matter that is distinguishable from Nishimura or AAPA is the limitation that "a sensor cable of said wire feeder, a gas valve control cable for a shield gas supplied to said welding torch and a welding voltage feedback cable are accommodated in said robot main body driving cable." Previously, the Examiner had believed applicant's argument hinged on the limitation that "a robot main body driving power cable and a robot control cable are connected between said robot controller and said robot main body."

The Advisory Action argued that a power cable 3 and many control cables 4 of Nishimura are not only within the robot main body but also accommodated in the robot main

body driving power cable. However, FIG. 1 of Nishimura shows that a power cable 3(3A) and control cables 4, although found within the robot base 2, are at a distance from each other and, therefore, are not in a state where one cable is accommodated in another cable.

The same applies for independent claims 2 and 4 except that claim 2 recites “a sensor cable” that is distinct from “a robot main body driving power cable” and that claim 4 recites that the cables are “accommodated in said robot main body driving power cable and in said sensor cable in a dispersed fashion.”

Therefore, since Nishimura fails to disclose this “accommodated in” limitation of the claimed subject matter, the rejection must be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-39626.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /michaelwgarvey/
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No.: 35878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 26, 2007